

Henry col 127

h D. F. A.'s.

VINDICATION

OF THE

B^p. of *S A R U M*,

FROM BEING

The AUTHOR of a late Printed
SPEECH.

IN A

LETTER to a FRIEND.

L O N D O N:

Printed, and are to be sold by *John Nutt* near
Stationers-Hall. 1704.

Price 4 d.

Admitted to the Hall on 1704

D. F. A. S.

AMERICAN

OF THE

BY OF S. N. R. U. M.

FROM BEING

The Author of a late Political
Speech

IN A

LETTER TO A FRIEND.

LONDON:

Printed by J. G. Smith, 17, St. Paul's Churchyard, London.

1794

D. F. A's.
VINDICATION

OF THE
 Bp. of *SARUM*,
 FROM BEING
 The AUTHOR of a late printed
 SPEECH.

In a LETTER to a FRIEND.

SIR,

SINCE you desire my Thoughts of that Speech which goes under the Bishop of *Salisbury's* Name, and which is cry'd about the Streets with *Defoe's* Pamphlets, having a nearer Resemblance indeed to the Tricks and Artifices of that Party, than to the good Sense and Ingenuity of that Learned and Reverend Prelate; I must own to you I look on it as Spurious, and as one of those *many printed Libels* taken notice of in the beginning of that Speech, wherein
 that

that Reverend Prelate, and others of his Order, *have been very indecently and unjustly treated.* For it is no new thing with that Party to vent Sedition, and Enmity to the Church under other Men's Names. Thus *The shortest way with the Dissenters* was to have pass'd for the Notions of a High Churchman; and above a *Million* of the Nation are abus'd by the late Diabolical *Legion*, which, if the Truth were known, would be found to have no Subscribers, but the Hand that wrote it, and those that pay him for doing so.

First then, I conclude the Speech supposititious because of its Length, it being improbable that any Bishop or Lord should make so tedious an Harangue, unless he'd a mind that the Auditory should fall asleep e'er he came to the end on't. And there being about four Months between the uttering the Speech and the printing of it, it seems rather design'd to shew what some are pleas'd to think might be said, than what was *actually* spoken.

Secondly, Because this Speech wrests Her Majesty's Royal Words to a Sense they will not bear, as evidently appears if she may be allow'd to be the most authentick Interpreter of her own Text. Read but *Her Majesty's most gracious Declaration*, Mar. 8. 1701. and all Her former *Speeches to both Houses*, and there you'll find that she constantly expresses Her true Concern for the Government in Church and State as by Law Establish'd. And declares, *That we may depend upon it, that no Pains or Diligence shall ever be wanting on Her Part to maintain*

MAR. 11. 1701.

MAR. 8. 1701.

maintain it. And in relation to the Church of England; Her Majesty is pleas'd to observe to us, Feb. 27. 1702. that it is a *Happiness and Advantage, to be of it,* that She has *had Her Education in it, has run great Hazards for it;* that her own Principles must al- May 25. 1702. ways keep Her entirely firm to its Interests, and will encline Her to countenance those who have the truest Zeal to support it. That She is resolv'd to defend Oct. 21. 1702. and maintain it. That She will always make it Feb. 27. 1702. Her own particular care to encourage and maintain this Church as by Law establish'd, and every the least Member of it, in all their just Rights and Privileges: And upon all occasions of Promotion to any Ecclesiastical Dignity, She will have a very just regard to such as are eminent and remarkable for their Piety, Learning, and constant Zeal for the Church, that by this and ALL OTHER METHODS WHICH SHALL BE THOUGHT PROPER, SHE MAY COMMIT IT SECURELY SETTLED TO POSTERITY. Now this being spoke at the conclusion of the former Sessions, those earnest desires of perfect Peace and Union, which Her Majesty is pleas'd to express at Her next meeting with Her People, can design nothing else but such an Union as may effectually compass that true intent and meaning of Her former most gracious Declarations, and firm Resolutions. It being Her Majesty's special Glory to be always found a strict and religious Observer of Her Nov. 9. 1703. Word, whatever may have been the Practice or Misfortune of other Princes. Mar. 11. 1701.

Well then, allowing Her Majesty's former Speeches, particularly That, at the close of the former Sessions, Feb. 27. 1702. to be a Comment

B

on

May 25. 1702.

Declara.

Mar. 2. 1701.

on that at the opening of the next, Nov. 9. 1703. 'tis evident, that *the Union which Her Majesty recommended with a peculiar Vehemence of Syle, was the uniting in such Methods as should be thought proper to transmit the Church of England securely settled to Posterity; to provide for a due Execution of the Laws* (which Her Majesty recommends in another Speech) against such as clandestinely break them; and to assist Her effectually, to compass Her Royal Desire of *Countenancing and Employing all those who shall heartily concur and join with Her, in supporting and maintaining the present Establishment and Constitution against all Enemys and Opposers whatsoever.* And what is this, but to unite in passing the *Bill against Occasional Conformity?*

See their Proceedings p. 30.
p. 27. p. 31.
Octob.

'Tis plain the Nation in general thought this Bill the *properest Method* in order to those great Ends. For it pass'd in two Sessions by a great Majority of the Peoples Representatives, being lost by a very small Majority in the Lord's House. And by whatever *Ways* they were brought to reject the Bill the last Sessions, 'tis certain that the Winter before, the Lords agreed to the farther *Measures propos'd by the Commons, to allow neither Dissenters nor Occasional Conformists any share in the Government.* For they own'd it to be a scandal to Religion, that Persons should Conform only for a Place;—and that if they can Conform for a Place, much more ought they to do so in compliance with the LAW, and for the sake of UNITY. By which it is evident, that the Lords could not then think that this Bill might tend to create *Disunion*

union and Discord; that their Lordships were of Opinion, that notwithstanding the Toleration, the *LAW* does still require Conformity; and that the whole Nation suppos'd that a Bill against Occasional Conformity would promote the *true Interest of England*. And we know that Her Majesty has assur'd us that *nothing shall be wanting on Her part to pursue that Interest, and to make us all Safe and Happy*. Now my Lord of *Sarum* has too good a Memory to forget the Premises, and is too just a Reasoner to draw a false Conclusion from them: Besides, he has too profound a respect for Her Majesty to pervert Her Royal Words: Hence I argue that the Speech is spurious. As also

Mar. 8. 1701.

Oct. 21. 1702.

3dly, Because this Speech reflects very severely on the Memory of our glorious Reformers, and on the Reformation; which according to this Speech, retains *Blemishness not easily wiped off*: Whereas it is well known what Honour the Bishop of *Sarum* has done to the Reformation by his learned Labours. Add to this, that his Lordship is too good an Historian to be ignorant that the *Capital Proceedings in those Reigns* were either for Treason or Blasphemy. And sure it was time for Q. *Elizabeth* to look about her when *Kit Goodman*, a Ring-leader of the Party, publicly vindicated *Wyatt's Rebellion* in Print, affirming that all those who took not his part, were Traytors to God, his People and their Country. As for that Maxims of the great Queen in relation to Dissenters of all sorts, every body may have a faithful account of them in Sir *Francis Walsingham's*

See Fuller's
Hist. B. 9.

See Cabala.

Walsingham's Letter to Mons. Critoy. And I am sure his Lordship's great Reading and Experience must needs convince him, that what Indulgence soever may be us'd in matters of mere Religion, yet *State Heresys* are to be more narrowly watch'd by all prudent Governments. And that whoever they be that set up any Authority above the Prince, whether Pope or People, making him accountable to them, and liable to be depos'd at Pleasure, let the Men of this Principle be Papists, Dissenters, or Churchmen, or of what denomination you please, they ought never to be admitted into the Administration, for they will certainly embroyl it. And therefore no Government, that means to be safe, and to make necessary Provision for its own lawful Security, can ever employ them.

4thly, Because my Lord is known to be a Master of Sense and Expression, whereas the Maker of this Speech has not manag'd his part *adroitly*, but has fallen into weak Reasonings beneath that learned Prelate, and even into Contradictions. For Instance, 1. The Speech will have it, that Mr. L—y's Writing for the Bill, *gives a just suspicion*. But Mr. L. has also wrote against the Quakers, has taken as much, or more Pains, than any Man to expose that Sect, who yet are generally reckon'd to be *Jacobites*. What follows? Is his Zeal against Quakerism, *with a View to that*, to which the Maker of this Speech, without any proof, supposes the Promoters of this Bill *are driving*? 2. The Danger of raising *Discontents or Apprehensions in great numbers*

bers at home, which the Speech uses as an Argument against the Bill, is a stronger Argument for it. We find by the Peoples Representatives, that the Body of the Nation are set upon it. They have their *just Suspicions and Apprehensions*; the Ruine of the Ecclesiastical and Civil Government, in the Reign of Her Majesty's Grandfather; the dismal Miseries of those Days, whose evil Consequences still affect us, and therefore cannot be forgotten; besides the Management, &c. which some will tell you has been more lately us'd, may justly allarm them: And therefore they think that now or never is the time for them to provide for their own Safety, and the Security of the Establishment in Church and State. And they think they have greater reason to do this, because *the Fury* (to use the terms of the Speech) *with which this Bill is oppos'd, does heighten the Jealousie*; for *what great matter could this Bill produce*, what hurt could it do them, if *there were not somewhat under their Clamours* against it, and if they were not afraid that it should put a stop to some Design, which it is not yet seasonable for them to own? Now since the Friends of the Constitution who promote the Bill are so numerous and so considerable, they are certainly able to give Disturbance, and therefore the *state of our Affairs* makes it *yet more unseasonable* to disoblige them. If they are too honest to give Disturbance, they are also too honest to have those underhand Designs, which this Speech would impute to them. And setting these supposed Designs aside, which none but the Objectors know of, *there seems to be*

C

little.

little in this Bill, as the Speech confesses. But if those who promote the Bill are no better than their Neighbours, and therefore may be provok'd; then you raise a more dreadful Apprehension by opposing the Bill, than that which you would pretend to lay. 3. The Paragraph about the *Title of the Bill*, is not at all to the point, and therefore my Lord would have been more ingenious than to have offer'd at an Argument from a Case not rightly put. Nor will it follow, that because Dissenters are *Tolerated* in matters relating to their own Conduct only, that therefore they must be *Tolerated in Practises dangerous to the Government*. If their *Children* do come over to the Church, 'tis more than they desire, else to what purpose are they so diligent in breeding up a Succession of Dissenters in their private Academics?

Then as for Contradictions, we are inform'd of *the happy Calm the Nation is now in*; but in the very beginning we are told *how much Heat this matter has rais'd*, and afterwards, of *Apprehensions, Fury and Jealousie*. And truly, by the Pamphlets cry'd about every Day, and by all that the Dissenters have writ ever since Her Majesty's Accession to the Throne, even before a Bill against Occasional Conformity was mention'd, it does not appear that there is, or has been, any happy Calm on their side. 2. This Speech makes my Lord profess himself and his Brethren *Disciples of the Cross*; and a while after it makes him tell us, *that the late King deliver'd us from all our Fears and Dangers, and that to him we owe our present Happiness*.

Happiness. Now how true soever it is that his Majesty deliver'd us from the Fears and Dangers of losing our Estates, what have the *Disciples of the Cross* to do with such a Deliverance? King *William's* Business was to *secure the Church of England* in her Possessions and Grandeur; whereas the Business of the Disciples of the Cross, is to quit all for Christ's Sake. And it is very certain that upon whatever Heroick Principles the late Revolution was founded, it was not brought about by the Doctrine of the Cross. It is therefore *mal à propos* to put us in mind of that exploded Doctrine. 3. We are told in the same breath of Queen *Elizabeth's* Severity and of her Indulgence. Now if the one is to be imputed to her, she can't be charg'd with the other; for I believe it will be allow'd on all Hands, that her Administration was not a weak and changeable, but a steady Government. 4. Not only from several Expressions in this Speech, but from my Lord's Character and the great Post he fills, it must be concluded, that he has a *true Zeal for the Church in all its Concerns*; for he has too much Honour to eat of her Bread and lift up his Heel against her. But this Speech will have it, that our *Differences* might have been *easily made up at the Restoration*, but that the Design was to *enflame them*. The Aim of the Speech shews, that it does not mean that the Dissenters had this enflaming Design, or hindred the Accommodation. Let us see then what were their Terms of Union; they were a *total Abolition of Ceremonys*, or *Liberty to refuse Subscription*; *no Oaths or Promises of Obedience to the Bishops*, nor any (what they

See Grand Debate p. 10.
Two Proposals
p. 6. 21, 23.

Barith Anti
Baal p. 23.

they call) *unnecessary Engagements*; Extirpation of Episcopacy, which Crofton an Occasional Conformist tells you, *he'll stand by, it must be extirpated, if King and Kingdom, or Peace and Glory must be preserved from God's angry Extirpation.* By all which it appears, that it is a Contradiction for that Man to pretend to be a Friend to the Church, who is for *such* a making up of the Differences between the Church and the Dissenters. And farther, the Paragraph about *High Church* either proves nothing or proves too much; for if the Writer of this Speech is not for the *Church of England, as by Law Establish'd*, he would do well to tell us to what *Church's Interest* it is that he has always adher'd.

Fifthly, Because I find Disingenuity in this Speech, I conclude that my Lord is not the Author of it. The Speech would insinuate that *Terms of Distinction* are rais'd by the Friends of the Bill on purpose to *distract us*; whereas, whatever the *Design* may be, all the World knows that the Names of Distinction come from the other Party, who take upon them to impose what Names they please on such as are not desirous of any; and they have their End in it. For it is but dressing Men up in Bear's Skins, and there will be Dogs enow to bait them. The Maker of this Speech tells us plainly, *he knows no High Church, but the Church of Rome.* Hence it follows, that they would have the World believe that what they call *High Church* is Popery, and that those whom they brand with the Name of *High Church-men* are Papists; which is a most outrageous

gious Injury to the *Legal Establishment* by supposing it Popish; and to those worthy Gentlemen who are call'd High Church-men only for keeping up to this Establishment, by supposing most unjustly that they aim at Popery. *Storys are made and publickly reported* of other Men besides the Head of his Lordship's Order, *which are not so*; as his Lordship knows, as also by whose *Relations and Dependencys* they are vented; and therefore he would be more Ingenuous than to lay all the Storys on one side. Nor would he be guilty of that Disingenuity which runs thro' the Speech. The supposing the Bill is but a *Step* to no Body knows what; and that there is *somewhat*, a Gunpowder Treason, no doubt, under it; (tho' in the beginning of the Speech it is suppos'd to be *well intended*) Much less would his Lordship make that odious Comparison between the Bill and the Inquisition.

For my Lord is not ignorant of the unblemish'd Character of those who promote this Bill in both Houses. To go no farther than the Bishop's Bench, the very worthy Archbishop of *York*, the Bishop of *London*, who shew'd such an eminent Zeal against Popery, and the rest of those learned and pious Prelates who voted for this Bill, are incapable of any Designs that they are asham'd to own. But it is an old Trick, as that *noble Historian* whom we have read *Vol. 1. p. 75* with *Pleasure* informs us, to awaken the Peoples Minds to a *Jealousie*, as if *somewhat more was intended than was propos'd*, for which they know the People will quickly find a Name, tho' they themselves

selves are the only Men that aim at *Innovations*. There is also a Disingenuity, or if you will, a Jesuitical Distinction, in the Observation upon the *Corporation and Test Acts*. Will any Historian conclude that the *Romans* allow'd a Man to kill his Parents, because there was not a *Clause* or a *Word* in any Law of theirs to forbid it? Surely *Church of Englandmen* by enacting that no Man should have an Employment, but who was at that Time a Member of that Church, *intended he should always continue to be so*. For they could not reasonably suppose that he who had been once a sincere Member of the Church, would ever forsake her for a Dissenting Congregation; and we can't have so ill an Opinion of our Law-givers as to suppose they intended to encourage Hypocrisie.

Once more, if it is true that the Numbers of the Dissenters are so considerably *abated*, at least a fourth, if not a third part, which I wish may be true, but is more than I can hear of from any other Hand; then since they were always a much less number than the Church, and are now so considerably lessen'd, there can be no great danger from their Discontent. But some Peoples way of arguing is very pleasant, the Dissenters shall be a very formidable Party, when the Business is to raise your *Fears of offending them*; but they shall dwindle to nothing and be inconsiderable, when the Design is to allay your *Fears of being hurt by them*.

Sixthly, This Speech misrepresents his Lordship; for tho' his Charity may prompt him to be
the

the *Common Agent* of the *Distressed*, yet since there are many in Distress besides such pernicious Persons as *Papists* and *Jacobites*, his concern for the Protestant Religion would not suffer him to be particular in his Favours towards these, except upon the laudable Design of converting and bringing them over to the right side; so that his Kindness towards this sort of People, ought to be ascrib'd to his Zeal and Concern for the Common Cause, and not to his *Moderation*; for all the World knows that his Lordship is not of a Luke-warm Temper.

Seventhly, That Want of Charity which I meet with in this Speech forbids me to ascribe it to that Reverend Prelate. Besides the Want of Charity to the Faithful Fathers and Sons of the Church, in supposing them to have Designs they are incapable of, and that they declare against; this Speech is uncharitable even to Dissenters; for it supposes they would so far prefer their own Private Interest before the Publick Good, even now that *All is at Stake*, their Country, their Laws and Liberty, and the Protestant Religion, as to give Disturbance at home, and assist the Designs of the common Enemy, unless they be humour'd and cocker'd in every thing. P. 4.

Lastly, And which is an incontestable proof, this Speech lays a heavy Aspersions upon Her Majesty, and therefore it can't be the Bishop of *Sarum's*. Allowing that the Promoters of the Bill had an aim at the Toleration; allowing that they should bring in a Bill to repeal it, and that this Bill should pass the House of Lords; What then?

then? the Dissenters are still safe, their Toleration as firm as the Laws of the *Medes and Persians*, they may *rest secure and satisfy'd* (unless nothing will satisfy them but the Ruin of the Establish'd Church) for Her Majesty has assur'd them, *She is firmly resolv'd to maintain that Act.* And I hope we are not yet, or ever shall, come to that pass, as that an Ordinance of one or both Houses of Parliament, shall go for a Law without the Royal Assent. So that unless they mean to insinuate that Her Majesty is in the Conspiracy against this Darling Toleration Act, all their insinuations are to no purpose. I am, &c.

FINIS

-
-
-
I
t
t-
nt
o
y
i-



